

Reilly Tar
St. Louis Park, Mn.

1. What information has already been provided to Headquarters?

If the response to any of the questions is readily available in Headquarters so state and give the names and telephone numbers of the people having the information and in what form (memo, report, etc.) it was supplied.

Dennis Devlin 8-472-3500

file re: case development

Frank Binos 8-426-8710

Fred Stiehl "

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



514590

2. What is the History/threat of the site?

A short, descriptive narrative of one to two pages is preferred with an appendix of significant dates. Include a list of substances found, or believed to be found on the site (with notations to distinguish the difference) and a short description of the population at risk and/or the environment affected.

1917-1970 coal tar refinery and wood treating operation
80 acre site St. Louis Park, Minnesota (w. suburb)

found - St. Louis Park purchased property 1971
polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons and phenol contamination of soil and groundwater within a 2-3 mile radius of the site

St. Louis Park water supply is from municipal wells, 5 of which have been closed since 1978 because of the PAH contamination.

Minnesota filed lawsuit 1970

U.S. filed lawsuit Sept. 4, 1980 Minnesota + St. Louis Park Joined 10/10/80

Reilly's answer due 12/19/80

3. What detailed studies have been performed on the site?

A short description of each study, with dates performed. The name of the contractor, the project officer (with address and telephone number) and a summary of the findings will be needed. A copy of the final report, or executive summary of each study will be requested to be sent to Headquarters. These studies include hydrogeological studies, soil, water and air monitoring, ground-penetrating radar studies and any others which define the extent of the problem, provide information needed to plan remedial measures and/or provide for a facility plan completely or partially clean the site.

In 11/80, a report was prepared, by M. Toepfer + D. Devlin, summarizing other reports prepared regarding the Reilly site. This summary report is itself very lengthy and summarizes approximately 50 studies.

Other studies are presently being conducted.

Please call Melvin Toepfer for reports (312) 886-6748

003651

4. What emergency/remedial actions are necessary to clean the site?

These actions are those necessary to completely eliminate or ultimately secure the hazardous materials on or off the site. The description of these measures should be as specific as possible and should reflect the data obtained in the studies supplied in answer to question 3. These actions are not limited to those already approved or underway but should be those that should be performed for a total cleanup of the site. These are, however, generic activities such as "removal of contaminated soil", "repackaging and/or removal of drums", "construction of a leachate collection and treatment system". Include the studies that should be performed in order to better define the remedial activities needed.

- ① treat & maintain the Illinois Park water supply
- ② remove or isolate and contain heavily contaminated soils
- ③ renovate all multi-aquifer wells, including W-23 (on-site well)
- ④ contain or cleanup all 5 aquifer systems
- ⑤ effectuate a well field management plant to monitor remedial activities

5. What alternative measures have been suggested?

For each activity prescribed in question 4 provide a list of alternative methods considered at the site to achieve the objective. If only one method is available to effect some remedial measure, or no alternative measures have been considered, simply state that as the case. If possible, provide the merits and demerits of each alternative considered.

remedial measures study is being conducted at present
due date 6/81/80

6. What is the final cleanup plan, if any, for the site?

unknown as of 12/15/80

consent decree is being negotiated with company for partial cleanup
as company doesn't have resources to undertake total cleanup

003652

7. What mechanisms are available for funding the above closure plans?

Such funding sources include 311 monies, state fundings, private sources through Administrative Orders or consent decrees, money "volenteered" from private sources, FIT contracting or subcontracting and Superfund money.

FIT contracting

MRI contract - \$50,000

U.S. EPA - U.S.G.S. interagency agreement

State of Minnesota - agencies + contract monies

St. Louis Park

Consent decree w/ Reilly

Superfund money

8. What actions have been planned for the site?

These remedial/emergency activities are a subset of those indicated under question 2 and include those actions for which RFP's, IFB's, and/or TDD's have been prepared. These are activities for which the scope of work and work plans have been developed but have not been initiated.

see #2 call W. Toepfer (312) 886-6748

W. part of site has been developed for housing.

9. What problems are present to prevent the implementation of activities under question 8?

Such problems may include awaiting final results of a necessary study, poor weather conditions delaying construction, disallowal of 311 money for the planned activity, extended contract negotiations, lack of subcontracting money under the FIT contract, public interference, lack of acceptable disposal site and/or method. Include the anticipated time to overcome the obstacles and any actions that Headquarters could take to expedite the solution.

n/a

003653

10. What actions are currently underway at the Site?

A brief description of the level of activity, extent of remedy anticipated, time of completion and associated costs (if available) of such activities as State-directed cleanup, 311 actions, owner/operator and legislation.

no cleanup measures undertaken yet
well abandonment program by Minnesota

11. Have cost estimates been developed?

At best estimate of the total cost should be supplied. If at all possible the rationale behind the estimate should be provided. Also, needed, if available, are the cost estimates for each anticipated activity described under questions 3 and 4. Include the dates applicable to each of the cost estimates.

cost estimates are being developed
preliminary report due 1/31/81
2d. report due 6/81

12. Have time estimates been developed? no

A best estimate of the total time needed to clean the site as well as times and scheduling for each phase of cleanup should be provided. Is a facility management plan available, or can one be developed? If so, please supply this information. If enforcement/legislation is underway have deadlines been established under Administrative orders or a consent decree? If so, what are they and are they being met? Has a case development plan been formulated? If so, what are the relevant dates?

management plan and remedial strategy being prepared ; due 6/81
U.S. filed complaint 9/4/80
CDP prepared RFA - call D. Devlin or M. Toepler
consent decree being negotiated

003654

13. What are the important circumstances relevant to the cleanup that should be considered?

Rilly hasn't the monies to undertake total cleanup

State and city have been joined as plaintiffs to our action

State legislature has appropriated over \$600,000 in the past to this action.

State contact — Steve Shabman (cash outlays; not agency monies)
8-716-7703

There has been press coverage concerning the Rilly site at least weekly for the past several years

For instance,

Enforcement/litigation - What are the prospects of getting a responsible party to affect the cleanup in an acceptable time? Is some necessary precedent being established?

Public Participation - Are public interest groups actively involved? To what extent? Supply names (and telephone numbers) of people that should be contacted if the site is selected for cleanup under Superfund.

State Involvement - What level of activity has the State shown in regards to the site? Should the State office be contacted directly? Who in the State office should participate?

Congressional Interest - Have any State or Federal Congressman shown a substantial interest in the site?

Notoriety - Have newspapers, television, activist groups publicized the site? Examples would be Love Canal, Memphis, Valley of the Drums, etc.

003655

SUPERFUND READINESS MATRIX

| Site Name, Location | Problem Identification | | | | Extent of Contamination | | | | | Clean-up Actions Identified | | | | | | Status of Remedial Actions | | | | | Miscellaneous Information | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----|--|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------|
| | Preliminary Assessment | Reconnaissance Inspection | Full Field Inspection | Lab Analysis Completed | Surface Water | Ground Water | Soil and Subsurface | Air | Environmental Priority/Significance Determined | Short-Term (Emergency Response/Removal) | Long-Term (Total Cleanup) Remedial Actions | Alternatives Identified | Alternatives Selected | Costs Estimated | Schedule Proposed | Engineering Plans Complete | Procurement Documents Complete | Contractor Selected | Work in Process | Cleanup Complete | Responsible Party Identified | Financial Capability of Party Established | Demand Made on Responsible Party | Remarks |
| Reilly Tar : St. Louis Park Minnesota | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | yes | studies will be complete 6/81 | 6/81 | 6/81 | 6/81 | no | no | no | no | no | no | yes | no | yes | 003656 |

003656